

MINNEAPOLIS NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

**HALE PAGE DIAMOND LAKE
NEIGHBORHOOD
ACTION PLAN**

Date Adopted by the Policy Board: June 6, 1994

Date Adopted by the City Council: July 1, 1994

Document Number: 94-208M

**H A L E
P A G E
D I A M O N D
L A K E**

HALE, PAGE, AND DIAMOND LAKE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION
5255 CHICAGO AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55417
612-824-7707

NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION PLAN

of the
Hale, Page, and Diamond Lake
Community Association

- HPDL -

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Plan is the result of thousands of hours of volunteer time over the course of 2 years. It is the story of a mother with two sets of twins under the age of eight with a travelling father, going to night school, volunteering at her children's school many hours a week, re-entering the work force full-time, and still finding time to devote to the NRP process because she cares that much about her community. It is many other fascinating individual stories, but the message underlying all the stories is that of people who care about their community and this City being willing to give time to make it better.

We cannot begin to thank all of those who helped but special thanks are due to members of the HPDL NRP Steering Committee as well as the Board of Directors. Some participated for only a short timer, but all gave valued contributions. Over the course of the 2 years we have had three staff persons, one-at-a-time. We could not have come this far without their willingness to put in incredible amounts of time and effort as we went down this uncharted path.

Guidance from City staff and representatives from the various NRP jurisdictions was also invaluable. We thank them for their willingness to share their knowledge and experience. Special thanks are due to the 120+ volunteers who door knocked their neighbors to distribute the survey, all who answered it, and all other neighborhood residents who cared enough about their neighborhood to invest time in it.

Board of Directors and NRP Steering Committee Members over the 2 years

Joe Barrett	Katie Hauselbauer	Charley Peterson
Mike Carter	John Hauslauden	Karen Pritz
Merle Davis	Scott Holdal	Tony Pucci
Tom Dial	Heidi Johnston	Chris Rice
Carolyn Erickson	Anna Korinko	Vibhu Sharma
Liz Fifer	Lynn Martin	Barb Schenk
Laurie Frevert	Dan McGrane	Dave Samuelson
Doug Frevert	Tom Moore	Steve Voss
Mary Ellen Godbe	Dean Olson	

Staff: Mary Ellen Godbe, 7/92-3/93; Guy Fischer, 4/93-6/93;
Barbara Anderson, 8/93-present.

City-staff: Jerry Schwingharnmer, Planning; Joe Horan, NRP/C.A.R.E.; Jim Moore, MCDA.

Jurisdictions: Aaron Isaacs, MTC; Jim Sutherland and Christine Kriz, MCDA; Bob Morgan, John Hotvet, and Mike Monahan, Public Works; Maureen Bazinet, School Board; Roger Downey, Public Affairs; Chip Wells, METP; Mary Barrick, Maureen Durand, Bob Mattson: and Harvey Feldman, Park Board; Barry Nelson and Sue Roethele, CCP/S.A.F.E.; ,Fim Heimerl and Inspector Steve Strehlow, Mpls Police Department.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	2
Section I Neighborhood Description	4
Section II NRP Participation Process	6
Section III Issues, Opportunities, and Challenges	11
Section IV Vision	15
Section V Action Plan	
Part I Creating Community/Crime and Safety	16
Part II Education	24
Part III Parks and Recreation	28
Part IV Housing	33
Part V Commercial Development	37
Part VI Public Transportation	40
Part VII City/County Streets & Services	43
 Appendix	
A. Minority Report to Parks and Recreation Objective 1	
 B. Action Plan Funding Sources	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

HPDL began the workshop phase of its NRP process with a kickoff at a community event attended by over 1500 people. Our efforts over the next year to determine what issues were important to neighborhood residents and what actions were necessary to resolve these issues were led by an NRP Steering Committee of volunteer residents with skills, talents and/or education that was invaluable. HPDL conducted a comprehensive survey delivered by hand to all 4200 + households, held events, focus groups, workshops, and many meetings. All efforts were pre-publicized, to the best of our abilities and resources, in our own newsletter, through mailings, listings in local newspapers, signs and/or posters. There were 1226 responses to the survey, about 2000 attendees at events, and at least 500 participants at meetings, focus groups or workshops.

The issues identified as most important to area residents were airport noise, crime and safety, and education, followed closely by highway expansion. Other issues such as parks, housing maintenance, traffic problems, local businesses, and social, recreational, and employment opportunities (particularly for teens) were of concern to residents as well. One thing that has remained clear throughout all discussions of the issues is that HPDL residents wish to develop stronger neighborhood ties and sense of community. To begin resolution of the issues and concerns of residents, we organized our goals; objectives, and action steps into 7 areas, summarized very briefly below. We knew that many of the concerns residents had concerned stresses such as airport noise that were larger than our neighborhood. Our job then became finding ways to: (a) work to eliminate or address these pressures as much as possible within the limitations of the NRP partners to effect them, (b) mitigate the effect of these pressures on neighborhood residents, and (c) encourage countervailing forces, those factors that will make the neighborhood so inviting that people will be more willing to stay in the city. This effort became one of providing reasons for people to choose to stay in the City, therefore it is a housing strategy, even if not directly related to the houses themselves. All the objectives and goals in the plan are directed towards this attempt. The plan is not about any one strategy, but is about multiple ways to improve the neighborhood, building on the strengths of the people as well as strengthening and bolstering the appealing features of the neighborhood to increase the sense of community. This fulfills our mission, in accordance with the Directions Framework goal to "Protect neighborhoods that are stable by ensuring that they continue to be places where people/families choose to live and invest." Therefore creating community became our starting point and permeates all other issues.

Creating Community/Crime and Safety: Our goal is to create a stronger sense of community and make HPDL a safer place to live, by: establishing block clubs, HPDL contacts and McGruff safe houses on every block; increasing interaction and communication between police and community residents ; promoting the neighborhood's image, attracting new residents and businesses, and increasing the pride of existing residents and businesses; improving the availability of employment opportunities, programs, and activities for all ages; sharing information among HPDL residents and between neighborhoods; and providing a neighborhood resource center with common space for neighbors to come together.

WPDL Action Plan

Executive Summary

Education: Our goal is to maintain quality education/schools in Minneapolis and increase the perception of that quality by: improving relations and strengthening communications between the School Board and Community; promoting greater interaction between schools and the neighborhood; facilitating improvements in programming and community outreach; increasing the ability of the school to meet the educational and physical needs of students and serve as a community gathering point and resource.

Parks and Recreation: Our goal is to improve parks so that they serve the needs of all residents and increase neighborhood livability, thus creating incentives for residents to stay in the City. This includes safety, accessibility and other needed improvements in park grounds, buildings, and programming done in partnership with MPRB, some city and county street changes to facilitate recreational use, improvements on airport owned property, creating links between parks; improving the environment; beautifying the neighborhood and working with MnDOT to improve beauty and natural environment as any highway reconstruction occurs.

Housing: Our goals are to create a safe and healthy environment for all neighborhood residents by creating housing strategies that rehabilitate existing housing stock, promote home ownership, increase the racial, cultural and ethnic diversity of the neighborhood, and create opportunities for older homeowners to remain in the neighborhood despite changing circumstances. This includes working with the airport and MnDOT to deal with their current operations and influence their expansion plans.

Commercial: Our goal is to create viable and attractive commercial/retail facilities that primarily serve the local area. This includes forming a local business association, facilitating improvements to existing businesses, encouraging new businesses to fill vacant commercial spaces where appropriate, and converting business properties to small-scale senior residences where appropriate.

Public Transportation: Our goals are to protect and improve neighborhood livability through comprehensive strategies that incorporate broader aims (such as less dependence on fossil fuels, decrease pollution across the country, world), strive to change individual driving habits, and include more mass transit alternatives. We will encourage public transportation options that have less impact on neighborhoods and the environment, and work to improve current MTC services.

City/County Streets and Services: Our goal is to present neighborhood input in city streets and services so that neighborhood service, safety, and beauty are enhanced by: collaborating on planning and designing streetscape improvements throughout the neighborhood; working with public agencies to ensure safer streets and responsive city services; and working with public agencies to improve neighborhood appearance and delivery of City services to residents.

SECTION I: NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

HPDL Community Association represents the residents of the Hale, Page, and Diamond Lake Neighborhoods as identified by the Minneapolis Planning Department's Communities and Neighborhoods Map. The boundaries are: Highway 35W on the west, 62nd St. on the south, Minnehaha Creek on the north, and Cedar Ave. on the east. The boundaries between the three neighborhoods and the rest of the city are physically defining since the highways, Minnehaha Creek and Lake Nokomis form barriers that prohibit easy neighbor to neighbor interaction. The boundaries between the three different neighborhoods, however, do not serve as physical barriers and do not represent any division of type or condition of dwelling -, economic status or background of its people, availability of services or access to the city, or predominant "feel"--there are no cleanly delineated, major differences between the neighborhoods. Indeed, the three neighborhoods have many common features and concerns.

This community is served by businesses within and adjacent to the three neighborhoods. Commercial establishments contained within our boundaries are mostly local service oriented doctor, dentist, etc. offices, small restaurants, or small retail establishments (dry cleaning, drugstore, etc), with one large grocery store. These businesses are scattered throughout the three neighborhoods, primarily in six "strips" of commercial development. Several of these commercial strips are in need of new tenants or conversion to other uses, as they have properties that have been standing vacant or are poorly maintained. Many of them could use an investment to create more desirable facades that would attract more customers. Additional commercial areas accessible to our residents are adjacent to our community. None of these commercial establishments offer large numbers of employment opportunities, although many do offer full or part-time job opportunities to smaller numbers of people.

There are 8 churches in our neighborhoods of various denominations. Educational facilities within our boundaries, are: a Minneapolis public school, (doubling as a Community Education Program Site), one parochial school, several preschool and/or day care locations scattered throughout the area, and a private school of acupuncture. While a few non-profit facilities are in the neighborhoods, we do not have a major social service presence.

Treasured resources of our community include: near-by Lake Nokomis with its adjoining park facilities, Minnehaha Creek with entry to the miles of bicycle and pedestrian pathways of this city, several tot lots, sledding areas, Pearl Park, Todd Park, and Diamond Lake with its nature path. Our proximity to Interstate Highway 35W, County Highway 62 (the Crosstown), the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, and major city arteries such as Cedar Ave., Chicago Ave and Portland Ave. offers us convenient access to virtually any destination in the City but carries with it the high price of airplane noise, highway noise, commuter traffic, air pollution and continued uncertainty of possible changes to any of the systems.

HISTORY(1)

The three neighborhoods are a part of the Nokomis Community, one of the oldest parts of Minnesota. Longfellow's poem about Hiawatha and his grandmother Nokomis, inspired by the Minnehaha Falls area drew tourists. The Godfrey dam and mills on Minnehaha Creek were built in 1853. Starting in the 1860's tourists and the local industry were served by the Minnesota Central Railway. Most of the community at this time was still farmland or marshy wilderness. Areas north of 54th street were annexed to the city in 1887. Minneapolis Transit Authority connected the area to downtown in the 1920's and the remainder of the area was annexed to the city in 1927. Diamond Lake was acquired by the Minneapolis Park Board in 1936. Dredging and filling of the areas that are now Pearl and Todd Park took place after this.

Most of the housing development in the area occurred between 1920 and the 1940s. The predominant housing in the neighborhood is English Tudor and the 1940-50's era of bungalows and ramblers. Between 1940 and 1950 growth in the area was spurred by demand from servicemen and women and employees of military and commercial aviation facilities. Lot sizes are not the city's standard 40 foot lots because of the curvature of the streets around Diamond Lake, Lake Nokomis and Minnehaha Creek. There are some homes, churches and businesses in the area worthy of consideration of Historic Preservation.

POPULATION

The population of our neighborhoods is fairly homogeneous, mostly living in homes that they own. As of the 1990 census(2), we have 10,456 residents in 4311 households, 94% of whom are white. An average of 95% of the dwellings in our neighborhoods are homesteaded, with over 86% being single-family dwellings. HPDL neighborhoods have an average of 31.1 % of homes with children under 18, as compared to the city-wide average of 24.4%.

(1) Much of the information from this section comes from the Minneapolis Planning Department's Summer 1992 "Planning and Information Base" for each neighborhood.

(2) Data from the "Planning and Information Base" for each neighborhood.

SECTION II: NRP PARTICIPATION PROCESS

Listed below are the ways in which we have met the inclusion goals of our NRP Participation Agreement. These include strategies we used to make sure that everyone's interests were represented. during the process.

1. Opened a community office, with telephone and answering machine to provide a central location for small meetings and information. The window of the office was used to display flyers and notices of meetings.
2. Hired a communications coordinator to staff the office, answer telephone inquiries and oversee house to house distributions and mailings.
3. Developed a quarterly newsletter that contained NRP related information. This newsletter was either hand distributed house to house or mailed out to all households using a list supplied by the City Planning Department.
4. Mailed or distributed flyers and letters to all households in the community. Mailed items were sent under Bulk Mail rates, making them susceptible to the vagaries of the Postal Bulk Mail Procedures. Additional reminders or flyers were sent to those on the membership list (those who attended a meeting or otherwise indicated interest in HPDL).
5. Developed a logo for the organization, created letterhead stationery, and used a consistent format for the newsletter and postcards to help identify our mailings.
6. Adhered to our set schedule of open, monthly general HPDL membership meetings on various topics and announced this schedule in newsletters, the local press (Southside Pride), at meetings, and sent postcard reminders to those who attended any meeting or indicated a desire to receive mailings. At all of these meetings, we provided NRP reports and updates, occasionally devoting entire meetings to our NRP process (presenting survey data report, first draft of Action Plan, etc).
7. Formed an NRP Steering Committee to oversee the process, with attention paid to obtaining some representation from each of the three neighborhoods, parents and non-parents, single and married, male or female. We were fully open to and actively discussed recruitment techniques to improve the participation of racial and cultural minorities. The socio-economical integration of our community and the small numbers of people identifying themselves as minorities meant that targeted actions would seem to be tokenism. NRP Committee meetings were held at semi-regular intervals and announced in the newsletter, local media, and at other HPDL meetings. (See listing of meetings after this strategy list)
8. Held a "kickoff" event ("Picnic in the Park") that drew at least 1500 people together, provided information on the NRP process, attempted to inspire excitement and helped to recruit volunteers.

9. Posted notices and reminders of HPDL NRP activities in our local park (Pearl), via bulletin board or other means.
10. Members of the HPDL Board of Directors or the NRP Steering Committee spoke at various community forums such as PTAs, senior groups, or churches.
11. Communicated with other community groups, such as Hale School PTA and Site Based Leadership Team, PIRC (the Pearl Park Improvement and Recreation Council) and topic specific groups such as SMAAC (South Metro Area Airport Commission) and NTN (Neighborhood Transportation Network).
12. Contacted local businesses and churches to encourage their participation with us and to ask for assistance in publicizing meetings and events (through postings in windows, bulletin boards, or their publications)
13. Had over 125 people make a good faith effort to personally hand out our detailed Survey of attitudes and priorities to every household in our 3 neighborhoods. The Survey Packet itself contained information on future events and a tear-off sheet that could be sent back to the office to indicate interest in activities or topics. (30% of the households responded)
14. Read through and coded the responses to the open-ended questions on the survey to familiarize ourselves with the unusual or infrequent response or idea.
15. Reported the results of our survey to the community at an HPDL General Membership meeting.
16. Convened focus groups or other meetings composed of representatives of: HPDL Board, seniors, youth, schools, churches, renters, and homeowners from the three neighborhoods (convened separately) to elaborate on the issues and concerns identified in the Neighborhood Survey, to see if any of the groups had a different slant on the issues, and to generate ideas for our HPDL Action Plan.
17. Held Workshops to brainstorm on neighborhood-based solutions to our concerns that were publicized by a flyer mailed to all residents. Workshops were held over a weekend to allow for maximum participation. An additional letter was mailed to those who had sent in a form expressing interest in workshops.
18. Held a meeting to explore the possibility of creative use of capital improvement funds with representatives of: HPDL Board and NRP Steering Committee, School Board, Hale School PTA and Site Based Management -Leadership Team, Community Education, Park Board, and Pearl Park.
19. Held several meetings with community residents, Hale School Staff, Parents and Teachers, to explore possibilities of collaborative efforts.

20. Published an outline of the first draft of the Action Plan in the June newsletter _ which was distributed to each household, inviting comment and review. Held a publicized HPDL General Membership meeting to discuss the plan and invite questions.
21. Convened meetings with interested community residents and representatives for NRP jurisdictions to receive their review and comments on the 1st, and 2nd draft of the Action Plan, notified all households with postcard.
22. Distributed the 3rd draft at a General Membership Meeting that was pre-publicized to the entire community, again inviting review and comment.
23. Had copies of the Action Plan Draft available at the 2nd Annual "Picnic in the Park", encouraging attendees to read and comment on it. Received ratification of the document in order to move forward into the negotiation phase under the guidance of the NRP Implementation Committee.
24. Distributed the Action Plan Draft in the September 1993 Newsletter mailed to all 4300 + households, again encouraging comments.
25. Presented Early Access possibilities to the community in the December newsletter, delivered to all households, asking for comments, notifying residents that the December general membership meeting topic was discussion of these possibilities.
26. Held general membership meeting discussing the Early Access possibilities. Removed from consideration those that raised unanswered questions or those members felt needed more consideration.
27. Presented remaining Early Access proposals to the Policy Board on February 7, 1994. A multiple neighborhood proposal tabled from consideration due to communication problem with one of the neighborhoods, other proposals passed unanimously.
27. Community residents ratified/affirmed the plan at February, 1994 general membership meeting by an overwhelming margin-222 yes votes, 35.no votes.
28. Created task force with Hale School site based management Leadership Team and HPDL representation to specify commitments needed from all parties, formalize working relationship, and begin to work on specific strategies for implementation.

MEETINGS HELD
8 HPDL General Membership Meetings:

At which the NRP was a major topic:(NRP updates given at all monthly meetings)

January 1992-	overview of NRP, recruiting people for orientation
February 1992-	report of orientation, recruiting steering committee, etc
April 1992-	ratification of participation agreement
January 1993-	survey results presented
June 1993-	presentation of 1 st Draft Action Plan
July 1993-	jurisdiction responses
December 1993 -	early access possibilities presented
February 1994 -	affirmation vote

NRP Orientation:

February 1, .1992, 6 attendees

NRP Steering Committee Meetings:

Average 8 per meeting, range 5-16

1992	1992	1993	1993	1994
Feb 24	Aug 11	Jan 6	Jun 9**	Jan 5
Mar 10	Aug 27	Jan 13	Sept 22	Jan 20
Mar 18	Sept 2	Jan 20	Oct 13	
Apr 7	Sept 10	Feb 3	Oct 20	
Apr 15	Oct 8	Feb 17	Oct 27	
May 6`	Nov 5	Mar 3	Nov 2	
May 12	Nov 19	Mar 24	Nov 17	
Jun 20	Dec 3	Mar 31	Dec 15	
JuI 13	Dec 9	Apr 14		
Ju1 22		Apr 28		
Ju1 30		May 12		
		May 26**		
		Jun 2		

*Survey Subcommittee

*Committee met jointly with Hale School parents, staff, and teachers.

Meetings Sponsored By NRP Steering, Committee:

Range: 1500-6 Median: 25

<u>Kick-off Coordinating</u> June 16, 1992 July 12, 1992 July 30, 1992	<u>Focus Groups</u> November 4, 1992 November 5, 1992 November 9, 1992 November 12, 1992 November 17, 1992	<u>Workshops</u> April 24, 1993 9:30-12:00 April 25, 1993 1:00-3:30
<u>Kick-off</u> August 13, 1992 5:00-8:00	<u>Ratification/Affirmation</u> August 26, 1993 February 21, 1994	<u>Preliminary Jurisdiction</u> July 19, 1993 July 21, 1993 July 28, 1993 August 4, 1993

PARTICIPANTS

20 have served on NRP Steering Committee at various times
14 Board of Directors members at various times 1500 attended kickoff
125 survey distributors
1226 respondents to survey
50 focus group attendees
500 entries on membership list (couples= 1 entry)
35 average General monthly HPDL Meetings, Range:20-150
1000 attended event at which first ratification vote taken (50-75 voted)
200 attended 2nd ratification meeting
77 voted with absentee ballots

SECTION III: ISSUES, OPPORTUNITIES, and CHALLENGES

To determine what issues and opportunities were important to residents of the Hale, Page; and Diamond Lake- neighborhoods, we conducted a survey and hold meetings, focus groups, and workshops. Some of the information gained from these procedures yielded data that can be quantified and will be reported. What cannot be quantified is the qualitative information - the depth of feeling revealed behind the fears and hopes, the concern about seeing so many next-door neighbors move away from the city, the reports of discussions about worries from other groups that meet in the community (school, church, park, business), and the individual discussions each of us had with neighbors and/or friends. All of us had qualitative data ringing in our ears as we looked at the quantifiable data and wrote our plan.

Throughout our NRP efforts we clearly heard a double edged message. While most residents have a fairly high level of general or overall satisfaction with the neighborhood, there is a surprising number of residents who would consider moving or are planning to move. This dissatisfaction stems from a wide variety of sources. There is a generalized perception that this is a critical time for our city, that the "inner city" of Minneapolis is in decline, leading to a rising level of crime in our neighborhoods and the resultant loss of feelings of safety. Broad issues such as airport noise, expansion of Interstate 35W, decline of the quality of the public schools, and the closing of neighborhood businesses as well as more specific issues such as speeding cars on local streets, houses that are not well maintained, and kids in the parks and lake areas late at night contribute to the undercurrent of dissatisfaction. Woven throughout all the expressions of satisfaction and concern was a sense of eroding community feeling and the concurrent desire to build a stronger sense of community.

DATA GATHERING

The first step in our data gathering was to ask people what issues should be explored in a survey. We did this by using a focus group format to elicit and prioritize ideas at an HPDL meeting in the summer of 1992. The questionnaire was designed by the HPDL NRP Steering Committee, which included several individuals fully experienced in survey and focus group research. A self-administered mail-back survey was delivered by hand to each of the 4,300 + households by over 125 volunteers in late September/early October, 1992. A total of 1,226 questionnaires were returned for a 28% response rate. The responses were coded, key-punched and computer-tabulated through a collaborative effort between the Steering Committee, the NRP, and the Minneapolis City Planning Department. Members of the Steering Committee personally read through all of the surveys and coded the responses to the open-ended questions in the survey.

During the month of November, 1992, HPDL conducted focus groups to obtain data on the neighborhood. These groups were small to encourage information of more depth than would be available from the survey. Focus groups were held for the homeowners in the P age, Hale, and Diamond Lake neighborhoods (separately), youth between the ages of 8 and 15 from all three sub-neighborhoods, renters, seniors, and the HPDL Board of Dir Directors. Approximately 50 to 60 people were involved in the process. Attendance at the renters and seniors focus group was too limited to be useful for data gathering. Attempts to reschedule the renters focus group and improve the publicity and recruiting still did not yield sufficient participants. Facilitators from the neighborhood asked the groups 7 questions about positive issues and negative issues on the neighborhood's past, present, and potential for the future. Data on both the survey results and focus groups were presented to the community at an HPDL meeting and were available to residents in an interim report.

Workshops were held on Saturday, May 24 at a neighborhood church, and Sunday May 25, 1993 at Nokomis Community Center. Three-hour sessions were held, with time allotted to each of ten categories identified through survey and focus group data as areas needing action: community business, parks and recreation, public transportation, seniors, marketing of the neighborhood and increasing sense of community, crime and safety, city services, education; teens, airport and housing. Workshops were facilitated by neighborhood residents, with emphasis placed on strategizing about solutions and actions to deal with issues and concerns raised in the survey, focus groups, and earlier meetings. Notes were taken on flip charts, allowing participant to see if their thoughts were recorded accurately.

Two meetings were held with interested community residents, parents, staff, and teachers of Hale School , the only Minneapolis Public School within our boundaries, on Wednesday, May 26, 1993 at Hale School and Wednesday, June 9, 1993 at a local church. These meetings were to gather additional information about the needs and areas of concern about education in general and Hale School in particular. The meetings were facilitated by a community resident as modified focus groups yielding data about issues and ideas for resolving problems, improving functioning of the school, and find ways to increase community/school interaction.

On Friday, May 21, 1993, a meeting was held at a local church to bring together representatives from HPDL, the Mpls. School Board, Mpls. Park and Recreation Board, Community Education, Hale School Staff, PTA, and Site Based Leadership Team, and Pearl Park Staff. This meeting was held expressly to explore the possibility of combining financial and operational resources in a partnership to arrive at a logical and efficient way of meeting the need within the community for a community center and large space for recreational, social, and service needs.

Meetings were held on July 19, July 21, July 28, and August 4, 1993 with representatives of the appropriate jurisdictions and community residents. At these meetings, the jurisdictional representatives provided the community with their initial responses to the first draft of the HPDL Neighborhood Action Plan.

RESULTS**Survey**

Survey responses came from 1226 households, closely matching the 1990 census data for the area. Responses were proportionally received from the three neighborhoods.

	% Households in HPDL Community		% of Responses
	1990 Census		HPDL Survey
Hale	31%		30%
Page	16%		19%
Diamond Lake	51%		53%
	<hr/> 100%		<hr/> 100%
	(N =4,321 households)		(N =1,226 households)

86% of the respondents rated the general quality of life, "good" (72%) or "excellent". Overall living conditions are rated "good" (75%) or "excellent" (15%) by nine out of ten residents. 46% of our residents like it here and plan to stay. However, 48% would like to or probably will move. Reasons for wanting to or planning to move most frequently included:

Airport Noise	99%
Crime/Safety	44%
Schools	27%
Taxes	26%
Environment	20%
Neighborhood	18%
Housing	16%
Recreation/Parks	12%
City Services	10%

The neighborhood's most appealing features included: convenient location (63%), well-maintained homes (53%), and parks and, recreational opportunities (47%). The specific issues needing urgent action or improvement identified by respondents in each of eight broad categories were:

Housing:	maintenance
Crime and Safety:	property security, personal safety, safety in parks
City Services:	snow removal, street/alley lighting and maintenance
Transportation:	35W expansion, light rail, speeding vehicles on local streets
Environment:	water quality, air quality
Quality of life:	airport noise control, sense of community, neighborhood businesses
Education:	quality of Minneapolis public schools
Teen problems:	lack of jobs, drugs and alcohol, crime: no place to go

Respondents were asked to identify the top five issues for neighborhood focus and change in an open-ended question. The most frequently identified were: Airport noise/location, crime and safety, schools, and 35W expansion.

Focus Groups

In reviewing the focus group data the value of a sense of community and the value of the people in that community stands out. People, community and the pride in that community are the largest categories in both the strength area and the opportunities area. Community and people are viewed as positives for the area currently and as it looks into the future. Other points of interest in the positive areas are good parks, current safety in the neighborhood, and maintaining and improving the neighborhoods' convenience to other areas in the Twin Cities.

Neighborhood negatives mentioned were increase in crime and the perception that the Twin Cities "inner city" is in decline. A primary issue noted for the decline was poor public schools and the decline of obtaining a quality education through the "inner city" public school system. Additional negatives mentioned were airport noise, closing of local businesses, and the expansion of Interstate 35W.

Other Data

Data from the workshops and other meetings, where residents proposed solutions to the issues and concerns, became the basis for action steps and were summarized in a draft HPDL Neighborhood Action Plan. Responses and input from the jurisdictions, from continued meetings and discussions around the community have been used to refine the plan in subsequent drafts and the final document.

SECTION IV: VISION

What we see in the Future--

We see a vision of the Hale, Page, and Diamond Lake neighborhoods as a continued vital, stable part of the city of Minneapolis in which people of diverse racial, ethnic; cultural, and socio-economic backgrounds live in harmony. We see a community that understands each others differences, shares a faith in our neighborhood, and works together to preserve positive features of our neighborhood and city, while striving to improve any negative. We believe in the viability of contemporary urban living and feel that we can **play** a role in emphasizing the positives of city living. By working together, we have the ability to effect change so that our City can serve as a positive model to other cities across the Nation.

We see a community of neighbors, who feel a sense of place where they live, who believe they belong to and are a valued part of the city. We see a place where people have connections to one another and to others across the city, where their concerns are taken seriously and addressed in an atmosphere of hope for resolution. We would like to see neighborhoods within the city and neighborhoods between city and suburb reaching out to one another, supporting each other's efforts to preserve their neighborhoods.

SECTION V: PART I - CREATING COMMUNITY/CRIME & SAFETY

Neighborhood Goal: Build stronger ties between neighbors, make HPDL a safer place to live, .create a stronger sense of community.

1. Neighborhood Objective: Create a safe and healthy environment for neighborhood residents by establishing an active block club, an HPDL contact and a McGruff safe house for children on each block in the neighborhood.

Strategies:

- A. Recruit and organize a block club on each block that does not already have one. Strive to establish two per week for two years.
- B. Encourage and work with CCP/SAFE to develop a strategy to broaden the function of Community Crime Watch Block Clubs so that they include community issues unrelated to crime; thus Crime Watch block club leaders could serve as HPDL contact persons.
- C. If this is not possible or the CCP block leader does not wish to be an HPDL contact, recruit an HPDL contact on each block willing to distribute documents when needed and participate in an HPDL telephone tree.
- D. Encourage CCP/SAFE to provide a curriculum which addresses prejudice and stereotyping when training crime watch groups.
- E. Recruit households to become McGruff Houses for children, supplement CCP/SAFE efforts to educate children on the purposes and proper use of the McGruff Houses; to take approximately five years, averaging two McGruff Houses per month, dividing neighborhood into increasingly smaller areas, working gradually down to one per block.
- F. Create a three year Block Club Incentive Fund, providing approximately \$100 per block for an active block club to buy motion detecting lights, plantings; or other activity designed to create/increase the sense of community.

Actions: CCP/SAFE

- a letter will be mailed to block club leaders asking if they would like to serve as HPDL contact persons, or if they would find another person on the block to do so;
- the quarterly newsletter *Eyes of the District* will include information about HPDL volunteer opportunities and events in HPDL when such information is provided to CCP/SAFE by HPDL, this information will be included when the timing fits the newsletter distribution schedule;

HPDL Action Plan

Section V

- blocks in the neighborhood which do not have a McGruff House within 660 feet of an age-eligible child's residence will continue to be identified; recruitment of McGruff Houses for these sites will continue per CCP/SAFE goals and procedures, i.e. applications, interviews, background checks and training; CCP/SAFE will welcome identification of potential McGruff Houses by HPDL staff and volunteers;
- new block clubs will continue to be provided home security devices related incentives according to CCP/SAFE policies, provided that block club leaders attend both training sessions;
- the suggestion for advanced block club diversity training can be forwarded to CCP/SAFE staff ad hoc committee researching advanced leadership training options; and
- CCP/SAFE will give consideration to HPDL organizing activities when planning yearly goals for new block club organizing.

Neighborhood

- provide staff support to an intensive organizing effort working with and supplementing CCP/SAFE efforts at recruiting block leaders and/or HPDL contact persons;
- help CCP/SAFE maintain block club network and communications;
- maintain HPDL contact network and facilitate communications;
- continue effort after initial period with neighborhood volunteers;
- develop the guidelines for allocation and uses of the Block Grant Incentive Fund; and
- administer the Block Grant Incentive Fund.

Resources: **NRP Funds** See Part I, Objective 7;
\$17,000 - Block Club Incentive Fund over 3 years.
CCP/SAFE Existing budget.

Timeline: 1994-1998

2. Neighborhood Objective: Crime prevention through increase interaction and communication between police and community residents.

Strategies:

- A. Develop a Community Oriented Police (C.O.P.) program with a designated Neighborhood Police Officer or "buy-back" time of officers to devote specific time to our HPDL area.
- B. Promote increased face-to-face interaction of officers and residents through: collaborations between Park and City police on bicycle patrol beats or other projects; participation of HPDL residents in "ride along" programs; officers spending time in community gathering places; providing access to community office to patrol officers and CCP/SAFE staff; encouraging officers to attend community meetings; and improving general communications.

Actions: MPD/Third Precinct

- a bicycle patrol program will be initiated with the "buy back" funds for two years during the spring, summer, and fall months;
 - provide HPDL the opportunity to participate in the selection process;
 - officers will be scheduled to attend meetings and events when contacted by block clubs and organizations a week in advance.
- Neighborhood
- participate in the bicycle patrol selection process;

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7;
 \$80,000 - Bicycle patrol "buy-back" over 2 years.
 If MPD "buy back" funds are utilized, the reallocation
 priority of NRP Funds is the Revolving Loan Fund.
MPD Existing budget.

Timeline: 1994-1998

3. Neighborhood Objective: Increase the social and economic stability of the neighborhood through education, social and public information projects highlighting community livability, convenience, and affordability to attract new residents and businesses to the neighborhood and increase the pride of existing residents and businesses.

Strategies:

- A. Welcome new people into the neighborhood with personal contact and information. (Possibly distributing it to every household initially, along with commercial directory listed in Part V, Objective 1.D.) Create:
 - i) a neighborhood video, ii) a neighborhood history, iii) a brochure, iv)
 linkages between potential residents and realtors and participate in home tours and buyers fairs.

Actions: Office of Public Affairs

- provide technical assistance to help develop the brochure and to help develop public service announcements for community events;
 - assist HPDL in working with realtors, participating in home tours and buyer's fairs, and promoting home remodeling.
- Neighborhood
- secure the assistance of Minneapolis Telecommunications Network and North High School for the neighborhood video project;
 - provide staff support to gather information, :organize neighborhood volunteers, and recruit sources.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part 1, Objective 7;

OPA \$700 - Brochure; \$500 - Video.
 40 staff hours.

Timeline: 1994-1995

B. Continue publication of the quarterly HPDL newsletter. Actions:

Actions Neighborhood

- provide staff support to recruit newsletter committee, oversee collection and writing of articles, and arrange publication and distribution;
- develop the capacity to self fund the newsletter through advertisement or other sources.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part 1; Objective 7;
\$25,000 - Newsletter costs over five years.

Timeline: 1994-1998

C. Sponsor community-oriented events for different interests, social or service in nature. Include an annual community clean-up to pick-up trash and junk, hazardous waste, and alleyways; and a celebration of the neighborhood at an annual celebration/gathering.

Actions: Mpls Planning Department

- review the application process for the CNAP Clean Sweep program to consider providing neighborhoods with approved action plans priority for Clean Sweep dates.

Mpls Park Board

- provide lead staff assistance for events held on Park property which provide event income to the Park Board.

Neighborhood

- provide staff support to the community events and annual clean-up.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7;
\$4,000 - Event costs over four years.

Timeline: 1994-1998

D. Increase visibility of HPDL and a sense of community within HPDL area including: i) HPDL office sign, and ii) sponsor a design competition for creating HPDL neighborhood signage/heraldry at entry points to the community.

Actions: Neighborhood

- provide staff support to coordinate and follow through with the design competition for creating HPDL neighborhood signage/heraldry at entry points to community;
- seek additional funds through private donations.

HPDL Action Plan

Section V

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7;
\$500 - Office sign;
\$1,000 - Entry point signs.

Private To be determined.

Timeline: 1994-1995

4. Neighborhood Objective: Address the social needs of neighborhood residents by improving the availability of employment opportunities, and social and educational programs for all ages.

Strategies:

- A. Create local job opportunities/training, and recreational and educational opportunities for teens with special emphasis on 12-16 year olds.
- B. Specific 1st Project: Youth Network, utilizing skilled community volunteers training youth in carpentry and other home maintenance skills through salvage and recycling of housing materials.

Actions: Mpls Employment and Training

- in the event the Youth Network project will involve youth (14 years of age and older) from low-income households, METP will work with the neighborhood in establishing the Youth Network project as a job site.

Neighborhood

- provide staff support to organize HPDL volunteers and to work in coalition with churches, parks, schools, and/or the Youth Coordinating Board.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7;
\$12,000 - Youth Network Project program costs over two years. ,
METP To be determined.

Timeline: 1994-1998

- C. Strengthen community outreach to all seniors, encourage their involvement in the community, develop opportunities and programs of interest to them.

Actions: Neighborhood

- provide staff support to outreach and develop programs.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part 1, Objective 7;

Timeline: 1994-1998

- D. Create a resource network of volunteers willing to help other community residents with a variety of tasks (e.g. snow plowing). Set up a bulletin board for neighborhood information, "swap" or "sell" ads, help needed/offered etc. The resources available or needed, and the bartering information would also be marketed through the block clubs.

Actions: Neighborhood

- provide staff support for initial setup and organization, and ongoing maintenance of the network;
- obtain supplies through donations by residents and/or HPDL fundraising activities.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7;
Private To be determined.

Timeline: 1994-1998

- 5. Neighborhood Objective:** Enhance educational opportunities by sharing information and creating ties among residents within the HPDL neighborhood and between HPDL residents and other city neighborhood.

Strategies:

- A. Collaborate with other neighborhood groups in establishing a community resource center network through the Neighborhood Resource Center Coalition (N.R.C.C.). Requires additional telephone line, stand-by fax line, additional computer monitor, printer, software and installation for HPDL; and space and equipment for other neighborhoods. Start with a one year pilot program.

Actions: Mpls Community Development Agency

- MCDA Citizen Participation will provide support to send neighborhood users through United Way training.
Neighborhood
- provide staff support to the Neighborhood Resource Center Coalition (NRCC) project;
- work with the (NRCC) intern to document needs, assess interest and strategies;
- assist Neighborhood Planning for Community Revitalization and the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs with coordination among other Twin Cities area groups involved in electronic networks and/or bulletin boards;
- assist (NRCC) with grant application to Pro-Neighborhoods.
- work with other neighborhoods to secure NRP funding for NRCC project.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I; Objective 7;
 \$2,000 - Start-up costs, approved as "early access";
Private \$10,000 - Grant fund application.
 \$4,372 - Neighborhood Planning for Community
 Revitalization Program intern (300 hours).

Timeline: 1994-1998

6. **Neighborhood Objective:** Improve public facilities to provide a neighborhood resource center and a focal point for achieving neighborhood goals with common space for neighbors to come together, interact, and create ties.

Strategies:

- A. Add space to Pearl Park, taking advantage of the currently scheduled capital improvements to Pearl Park and the extent to which Pearl Park is already a community focal point.
- B. Include:
- a) minimum 500 square feet for Neighborhood Resource Center, HPDL, and other local community organizations administrative space;
 - b) small meeting space;
 - c) kitchen;
 - d) large gathering /meeting spaces for organizational, recreational, and social functions for all HPDL area residents; and
 - e) space for on-duty officers and CCP/SAFE team to use for phone or paper work.

Actions: Mpls Park Board

- the Park Board will submit for the 1995 Capital Improvement Program a request for 51,000,000 for Pearl Park facilities and grounds upgrade contingent upon additional NRP fund allocations included in the action plan.
- Neighborhood participate in on-going citizen advisory process for Pearl Park improvements.

Resources: NRP Funds \$63,000 - Capital costs related to Objective 6.B.(a),(b),(e);
 \$30,000 - Operating costs related to Objective 6.B.(a),(b),(e).
Park Board \$1,000,000 - Net debt bonds.

Timeline: 1995-1996

- 7. Neighborhood Objective:** Secure resource necessary to implement HPDL Neighborhood Action Plan goals and objectives.

Strategies:

- A. Utilize NRP funds to engage directly or by contract personnel and to cover associated costs for the implementation of the following objectives: Part I, Objectives 1,2,3,4,5,6; Part II, Objectives 1,2,3; Part 111, Objectives 5,6; Part IV, Objectives 1(A), 3; Part V, Objective 1; Part VI, Objectives 1,2,3; and Part VII, Objectives 1,2,3.

Actions: Neighborhood

- hire two organizers to support implementation of the activities generated by HPDL goals and objectives.

Resources: NRP Funds \$57,500 - Year 1;
857,500 - Year 2;
\$28,750 - Year 3;
\$28,750 - Year 4;
\$28,750 - Year 5.

Timeline: 1994-1998

SECTION V: PART II - EDUCATION

Neighborhood Goal: Maintain quality education/ schools in Minneapolis and increase the perception of that quality.

1. **Neighborhood Objective:** improve relations and strengthen communications between School Board and Community.

Strategy:

- A. Encourage information sharing between community and district to ensure that citizen and school concerns and issues are heard. Send community/Hale School representative to School Board meetings, invite School Board members to attend community meetings.
- B. Work with the School Board to aim public relations/marketing efforts to "sell" the quality of Mpls Public Schools.
- C. Promote communications between the. School Board and the community about busing issues and the strong feelings in this community about busing. Promote alternatives that will lead to less money and time spent in busing without compromising equality of educational opportunity for all students.
- D. Request that clearer directions and guidelines be given to site-based management groups in schools; that the School Board make clear its commitment to site-based management; and that the School Board ensure that all school administrations commit to site-based management ideals.

Actions: Neighborhood

- provide staff support to coordinate implementation of strategies.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7.

Timeline: 1994-1998

2. **Neighborhood Objective:** Promote greater interaction and responsiveness between public schools and the community by facilitating improvements in programming, communications, and community outreach.

Strategies:

- A. Provide an HPDL representative to Hale's site-based management team and request Hale representation at HPDL, and participate in joint staff/parent/community events at Hale School. Create liaison with neighborhood private schools such as Our Lady of Peace (OLP).
- B. HPDL assist Hale School in developing/implementing strategies designed to demonstrate to the community the quality of education at Hale School.

- C. Provide more community service opportunities for children by promoting creative partnerships between the School Board, Hale School, Community Education, community residents, Park Board, churches and other organizations.
- D. Share school/community information through announcements and articles in the respective newsletters.

Actions: Hale School

- Hale Leadership Council passed a resolution on March 15, 1994 to actively support the communications liaison position for the 1994-95 school year with the following intent:
 - a) publicize Hale activities and special occasions to the community; b) work with the Communications Officer on the Council to help implement the Hale Communications Plan; and
 - c) collect and organize community input to Hale as characterized by the HPDL proposal, Part II and III.

Neighborhood

- provide staff to support implementation of strategies.
- HPDL representative has been nominated as a community representative to the Hale Leadership Council.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7;
Up to \$2,000 - Mailing, printing, and other communications costs over three years.

Timeline: 1994-1998

- E. Install a sign for the Hale School yard for informational announcements.
Request community announcements on OLP sign.

Actions: Mpls School Board

- appropriate funds and install sign.
- Neighborhood
- submitted project as an "early access" request and approved by NRP Policy Board February 7, 1994.

Resources: School Board \$3,000 - School's NRP funds and existing budget for operating costs.

Timeline: 1994

- F. In conjunction with Hale School PTA and Leadership team, create a three year pilot program for a volunteer coordinator position at Hale School. Position will work in conjunction with communication liaison in Strategy D to enhance communications and involvement between the school, community, and parents, particularly in population groups with language barriers.

Actions: Hale School

Hale Leadership Council passed a resolution March 15, 1'994 to work in partnership with HPDL to create a parent liaison/volunteer coordinator position at Hale.

Neighborhood

- provide staff to support the implementation of the strategy;
- in conjunction with Hale School PTA and Leadership Team will hire a person to work at the school- as a coordinator. of volunteers, with hiring preference given to parents of Hale School students and residents of the HPDL area.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7; -
Upto \$25,000 -Personnel and associated costs
including a separate telephone line over three years.

Timeline: School years: 1994-1995, 1995-1996, 1996-1997

- 3. Neighborhood Objective:** Assure that the school in the neighborhood meets the educational and physical needs of students and the community, and increase access to the school and its ability to serve as a community gathering and focal point.

Strategies:

- A. Enable a new, creative use/activity assessment study to be conducted at Hale School. Consultant to be hired and HPDL to make a hiring recommendation to School Board from 3-5 candidates School Board proposes. The consultant will:
- (1) Review and evaluate uses of the facility for:
 - a) children's educational requirements including - adequate space inside for educational and physical needs of students, and adequate space outside for needs of students,
 - b) parents ability to access children's education and activities,
 - c) community education opportunities for children and adults,
 - d) community access to building /programs, and
 - e) space for Hennepin County services.
 - (2) Assess how current facility can met these needs taking into account School District plans to undertake major deferred maintenance, accessibility, and life and safety work at Hale School as identified in the, December 1992 Facility Condition Analysis, known as the ISES.
 - (3) Propose changes in facility and program to meet these needs in the context of the City as a whole.
 - (4) Document and account for the operating budget impact of any capital expenses.
 - (5) Identify stand-alone projects that can be funded/accomplished with community collaboration, such as playground improvements-or grounds beautification.

- (6) Report findings to Hale School, School District, School Board, and HPDL.
- B. Participate in' joint school-community review of the proposed changes, evaluate and prioritize them to best meet all parties interests.
- C. Assist implementation of proposed changes agreed upon by HPDL, Hale School and the School Board, through offering NRP matching funding, as detailed below.

Actions: Hale School

- Hale Leadership Council passed a resolution March 15, 1994 that: a) in the spring of 1994, one member of the Hale Leadership Council will be designated to serve as champion for the Hale facilities agenda; b) this person will establish a permanent sub-committee of appropriately representative members to define the issues and appropriate process for pursuing the facilities agenda based on all relevant input, including past Hale facilities studies/recommendations, HPDL study/recommendations, and district studies/recommendations; c) the efforts of this subcommittee will not be constrained by traditional institutional perspectives but inclusive of larger community perspectives.

Neighborhood

- provide staff to support the neighborhood's involvement in the implementation of the objective.

• Joint

hire a consultant to lead the study, involving all parties and developing recommendations for changes in operations, programs, and facility. School District representatives, Hale School, and HPDL are investigating the option of using the services of a consultant pair, Rockcastle and Leer, who are skilled in creative grassroots, empowering, collaborative studies of institutional facilities, programs, and resources ultimately discovering mutually agreeable, innovative, efficient actions. Exploratory; preliminary meetings have been held with all parties. Specific proposal from consultants will be developed by the end of May that will be accepted, modified, or rejected by the School Board, Hale Leadership Team, PTA, and HPDL Board.

Resources: NRP Funds

See Part I, Objective 7;
Upto \$403,000 - Facility and program costs expended if leveraged against School NRP funds and private funds.

Private

Potential Center for Regional and Urban Affairs (CURA) funds for 1/6 time of a University staff member and 1/2 time of a graduate research assistant.

Timeline: 1994-1998

SECTION V: PART III - PARKS AND RECREATION

Neighborhood Goal: Improve parks to serve needs of all residents and increase neighborhood livability, to help keep residents in the City.

1. **Neighborhood Objective:** Ensure that Pearl Park has the physical capacity to function more as a community gathering point, serving the needs of youth, seniors, and community groups.

Strategies:

- A. Upgrade safety, access, and use of Pearl Park building by: instituting changes required by the American Disabilities Act (ADA); adding air conditioning; and providing sufficient meeting space, and adequate large space to accommodate such things as congregate dining for seniors, meetings of over 100 persons, activities designed to constructively occupy youth, and recreational use of all types for all ages (i.e. senior card games, square dancing, preschool large motor games, or basketball).

Actions: Mpls Park Board

- will submit for the 1995 Capital Improvement Program a request for **\$1,000,000** for Pearl Park facilities and grounds upgrade contingent upon additional NRP fund allocations included in the action plan.
- Neighborhood
participate in on-going citizen advisory process for Pearl Park improvements.

Resources: NRP Funds \$457,000 - Leverage Park Board capital funds.
Park Board \$1,000,000 - Net debt bonds.

Timeline: 1995-1996

- B. Incorporate a Neighborhood Resource Center in Pearl Park.

Actions: See Part I, Creating Community/Crime and Safety, Objectives 6.

2. **Neighborhood Objective:** Upgrade appearance and safety of Pearl Park grounds and fields.

Strategies:

- A. Upgrade fields and grounds to facilitate usage for a broad spectrum of neighborhood residents - walkers, sports enthusiasts, picnickers, bike riders, skaters, children, families, nature lovers, and others.

HPDL Action Plan

Section V

- B. Participate in the on-going citizen advisory process for Pearl Park improvements.
- C. Improve athletic fields to reduce injury.
- D. Add portable toilets to the north end of Pearl Park in the least aesthetically objectionable way.

Actions:

- Mpls Park Board
the Park Board will submit for the 1995 Capital Improvement Program a request for \$1,000,000 for Pearl Park facilities and grounds upgrade contingent upon additional NRP fund allocations included in the action plan.
- Neighborhood
participate in on-going citizen advisory process for Pearl Park improvements.

Resources: NRP Funds \$150,000 -Leverage Park Board capital funds.
Park Board \$1,000,000 - Net debt bonds.

Timeline: 1995-1996

3. **Neighborhood Objective:** Address the health, safety, and social needs of neighborhood residents through increased programming and building access at Pearl Park.

Strategy:

- A. Increase the amount of programming available to youth, especially those ages 12-15.
- B. Organize and arrange training for community volunteers so that the Pearl Park building is open and available to the community as needed to support additional programming.

Actions:

- Mpls Park Board
continue the Youth In Minneapolis After-school Program (Y-MAP) at Pearl Park for middle school youth;
- develop Y-MAP programming at the neighborhood level with parent and youth involvement;
- utilize the HPDL block network to recruit community residents for volunteer positions at Pearl Park, develop volunteer position job descriptions, and provide training for the volunteers.
- Neighborhood
help recruit community residents for volunteer positions.

Resources: NRP Funds \$20,000 - Program costs over five years.

Timeline: 1994- 1998

4. **Neighborhood Objective:** Improve safety and aesthetics of Diamond Lake nature area.

Strategies:

- A. Create a paved path at Portland Avenue street grade level along the east side of Diamond Lake from 58th Street to Diamond Lake Road to improve the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians, especially children travelling to Todd and Pearl Parks. (Possible tie-in with streetscape improvements under Part VII, City/County Streets, Objective 1.)
- B. Continue past nature path improvements to extend from 58th Street south to final stairway by Diamond Lake Lutheran Church.

Actions: Mpls Park Board

- construct the improvements submitted by the neighborhood as an "early access" project.
- Neighborhood
- submitted project as an "early access" request and approved by NRP Policy Board February 7, 1994.

Resources: NRP Funds \$85,000 - Capital costs for "early access" project.

Timeline: 1994

- C. Work to ensure that the grit chambers are installed to filter run-off from the Crosstown and 35W Highways before entering Diamond- Lake.

Actions: Mpls Public Works

- work to incorporate into Crosstown and 35W construction projects.

Resources: To be determined

Timeline: To be determined

5. **Neighborhood Objective:** Improve the safety, accessibility of other HPDL parks and create links between parks.

Strategies:

- A. Improve pedestrian/cyclist safety on Lake Nokomis bike/walking paths by completing a portion to go under Cedar Avenue bridge. Improve the lighting, especially on the lagoon side of Lake Nokomis.
- B. Work to improve paving and maintenance of the Lake Nokomis bike/walking paths to improve safety and comfort.

- C. Add portable toilets to Edgewater Tot Lot and Todd Park in the least aesthetically objectionable way.
- D. Improve the aesthetics of airport-owned green space at 58th Street and 14th Avenue. Possibly add bike and pedestrian walking paths and any other uses compatible with airport proximity such as fields for soccer or picnic areas.
- E. Link the above area to the Nokomis/Minnehaha Creek area by delineated street path. This major entry point into the neighborhood could be linked to Father's Lake and adjacent Richfield Parks.
- F. Link Richfield's Legion Park to Pearl Park/Todd Park/Diamond Lake area to improve safety of bicyclists and pedestrians.
- G. Create a "Grand Round" of neighborhood parks using bike paths in streets if green space connection is not possible.
- H. Create map for pedestrians and cyclists that includes neighborhood green spaces and ways to travel between them.

Actions: Mpls Park Board

- will submit a proposal to LCMR for 1995 funding to construct barrier free pedestrian and bicycle paths and neighborhood connections at Lake Nokomis Regional Park, and to construct bicycle paths on public land and on-street bicycle lanes connecting Minnehaha Creek and Lake Nokomis Regional Park to Diamond Lake, Taft and Legion Lakes.

Mpls Public Works

- work in partnership with the Park Board and the neighborhood to design a pedestrian/bicycle system that is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

Neighborhood

- provide staff support to work in cooperation with respective agencies and departments for both Minneapolis and Richfield.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7.
Grants \$176,000 - LCMR grant application.

Timeline: 1995-1996

6. **Neighborhood Objective:** Improve the natural environment, beautify the neighborhood.

Strategies:

- A. Sponsor a Design/Beautification/Greening group that will inventory green spaces in the neighborhood and study possible uses for them in conjunction with Park Board. *Look for* places throughout *HPDL* to put in tot lots such as Bloomington Avenue and 49th Street, increase planting sites for trees, flowers, and shrubs along green strips or within existing parks, and possibly add community gardens. Improve the aesthetics of entry points into the neighborhood.
- B. Implement recommendations from the Greening group, working with residents in adjoining areas and Park Board staff where appropriate. Use "adopt a park" strategies or work with Park Board to come up with funding and maintenance plans, and to assist Park Board in performing maintenance tasks.

Actions: Mpls Park Board

- work with neighborhood Greening group and assist with implementation of recommendations;
 - seek to leverage private, city, county, state and federal funds.
- Neighborhood
- organize and sponsor a Design/Beautification/Greening group; provide staff support to the Greening group;
 - implement Greening group recommendations;
 - seek to leverage private, city, county, state and federal funds.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7;
\$7,500 - Greening projects over five years.
Public/Private To be determined.

Timeline: 1995-1999

SECTION V: PART IV - HOUSING

Neighborhood Goal: Stabilize neighborhood housing stock with housing strategies that rehabilitate existing houses, promote home ownership, increase the diversity of the neighborhood, and create opportunities for older homeowners to remain in the neighborhood.

1. **Neighborhood Objective:** Minimize the impact of airport noise on housing to maintain stability if neighborhood.

Strategies:

- A. Set up a matching revolving loan fund with NRP dollars and a bank or other private source to enable property owners to perform soundproofing improvements and/or maintenance.

Actions: Mpls Community Development Agency

- MCDA's Residential Finance Department will assist the neighborhood in designing and implementing the revolving loan program.

Neighborhood

- establish parameters for the loan program, such as income limits for borrowers, maximum loan amount, loan interest rate, maximum term, and eligible work;
- secure the participation of a bank or other private source to administer the loan program;
- provide staff support to the loan program.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7; \$330,000 - Revolving Loan Fund.

MCDA 75 to 90 staff hours.

Private To be determined.

Timeline: 1994-1998

- B. Work with FAA to expand, improve, and loosen the lottery process to fund remodeling necessary for soundproofing, allow for retroactive compensation for soundproofing done by homeowners within certain criteria, and/or assign lottery numbers to all households now so that homeowners, particularly sellers and buyers, have full disclosure.
- C. Educate community-at-large about airplane noise as a health and housing issue and the fear that continued rapid turnover of houses will lead to instability which will affect housing values and the City tax base.
- D. Continue to support airport relocation and a reduction in airport noise wherever the airport is located. (See Part V, Public Transportation, Objective 1.A.)

Actions: Neighborhood

- coordinate and disseminate information.

Resources: To be determined

Timeline: Ongoing

2. **Neighborhood Objective:** Minimize impact on homes from Highways 35W or Crosstown construction done to improve safety and add Light Rail Transit.

Strategies:

- Keep fully informed about the specific HPDL homes that will be affected by highway reconstruction.
- Supplement MnDOT and Federal Relocation program to help those who would be forced to move due to 35W or Crosstown reconstruction to enable them to remain in the neighborhood. MCDA could help neighbors find housing options within the neighborhood, possibly providing first access to available loan packages.
- Work with MnDOT to protect the value of homes that are not destroyed. If property values are reduced by remaining close to highway, ask that those homeowners be given options of relocation. Request MnDOT to provide plantings, attractive noise barriers, and other amenities to mitigate the impact on remaining homes.

Actions: Mpls Public Works

- continue to update City Council Members as changes occur; add interested community residents names to the newsletter mailing list.
- City Council
- provide information to the neighborhood as changes occur to construction plans.
- Neighborhood
- encourage neighborhood residents to signup for the Public Works newsletter mailing list.

Resources: To be determined

Timeline: Ongoing

3. **Neighborhood Objective:** Ensure that the existing housing stock is well-maintained.

Strategies:

- A. Develop a housing assessment study/plan to identify HPDL homes with maintenance problems and their causes. The plan could be an HPDL neighborhood study done with the help from city sources such as housing conditions maps, or as part of a city-wide study of similar neighborhoods that a City Department might perform.
- B. Use the matching revolving loan fund set up in Objective 1.A. to enable property owners to perform maintenance improvements identified above.
- C. Apply "This Old House" legislation also to lots in order to provide incentives to purchase and rebuild alley homes/cottages where appropriate.

Actions: Mpls Planning Department

- provide data and other information for the housing assessment study.
- Neighborhood
- integrate improvement needs identified by the study into the Revolving Loan Fund program (Strategy 1.A.).
- HPDL Community Association has applied and have been awarded on internship position by the Neighborhood Planning and Community Revitalization Program to conduct the housing study.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7.
Private \$2,129 - Neighborhood Planning and Community Revitalization Program intern (260 hours)

Timeline: 1994-1996

4. **Neighborhood Objective:** Increase housing options for seniors so that they can remain in the neighborhood even if they wish to move from their homes.

Strategies:

- A. Convert under-utilized commercial properties to senior housing if owners are willing to cooperate and projects are financially viable for developers. Smaller units such as four-plex condominiums or apartments could be used to fill the need for housing for seniors who wish to give up the responsibility of a home, but do not wish to leave the neighborhood.
- B. Explore other options for housing or creative partnering.

Actions: Mpls Community Development Agency

- explore development options with the neighborhood as opportunities and interest arise.

Neighborhood

mobilize action through the neighborhood housing committee.

Resources: *NRP Funds* *To be determined*

Timeline: To be determined

SECTION V: PART V - COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Neighborhood Goal: Create viable and attractive commercial/retail facilities that primarily serve the local area:

1. **Neighborhood Objective:** Increase the economic stability of the neighborhood through the establishment of a neighborhood **business** association to facilitate communications between business owners and community, represent business interests to HPDL, coordinate business improvement projects and plans outlined in this Action Plan.

Strategies:

- A. Encourage HPDL businesses to form a business association.
- B. Recruit a business owner/operator/employee to serve as liaison to HPDL Community Association's Board of Directors or commercial committee.
- C. Distribute commercial business plan and development package that is currently being developed by the MCDA to identify the primary nodes or commercial activity in the neighborhood; provide incentives and information to help improve existing businesses and attract new businesses to the community as necessary.
- D. Create a Business Directory with assistance from the MCDA and distribute to local businesses and residents.

Actions: Mpls Community Development Agency

- will assist the neighborhood in the formation of a business - association, in providing existing program information, and creating a business directory;
- assist the business association in securing Neighborhood Economic Development Funds (NEDF).
- Neighborhood
provide staff to support implementation of the objective.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7; \$1,500 - Marketing program.
MCDA 40 staff hours;

Timeline: 1994-1998

2. **Neighborhood Objective:** Rehabilitate the commercial areas.

Strategies:

- A. Develop rehabilitation plans with community and business association partnership.
- B. Offer MCDA 2% loan package to businesses for renovation/expansion. Use NRP funds in a match with local financial institution to establish a revolving loan fund.

Actions: Mpls Community Development Agency

- market MCDA loan and grant programs for businesses;
- assist Business Association in the development of program guidelines for a Commercial Rehabilitation Fund.

Neighborhood

- work IN partnership with the Business Association to develop rehabilitation plans.

Resources: NRP Funds \$100,000 - Commercial Rehabilitation Fund.
MCDA 44 staff hours.
Private To be determined.

Timeline: 1994-1996

3. **Neighborhood Objective:** Improve commercial services and businesses.

Strategies:

- A. Encourage residents to support local businesses. When HPDL newsletter becomes self-funding, encourage advertisements from local businesses.
- B. Investigate improving parking near/behind area businesses. (Include this as part of streetscape study under Part VII, City/County Streets and Services, Objective 1.A.)

Actions: To be determined

Resources: To be determined

Timeline: Ongoing

4. Neighborhood Objective: Develop vacant commercial properties.**Strategies:**

- A. Northwest corner of 60th Street and Portland Avenue: Through MCDA, encourage developers to improve this corner, realizing that this community wants to retain its primarily residential character. A single commercial building that is multi-tenanted would be acceptable if tenant businesses are compatible with the adjacent residential areas, add convenience and value to the community as a whole, and serve the local market.
- B. Look into commercial conversion to housing of under-utilized properties. (See Part IV, Housing, Objective 4.A.) Convert site(s) to a senior condominiums, townhomes, or apartments by encouraging owners to sell property, and attracting developers.

- Actions:** Mpls Community Development Agency
- explore redevelopment options for 60th Street and Portland Avenue with the neighborhood as opportunities and interest arise;
 - explore housing conversion options with the neighborhood as opportunities and interest arise.

Resources: MCDA 80 staff hours.
Private To be determined.

Timeline: 1994-

SECTION V: PART VI - PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Neighborhood Goal: Protect and improve neighborhood livability through comprehensive strategies that incorporate the broader aims of less dependence on fossil fuels and decreasing pollution across the country and world; strive to change individual driving habits; and include more mass transit alternatives.

1. **Neighborhood Objective:** Reduce airport noise.

Strategies:

- A. Encourage development of incentives for airlines to use quieter planes - stage III aircraft, sooner and with greater frequency; enforce airport noise restrictions such as night time bans; and support the spread of noise patterns around the metro area.
- B. Supply stickers to residents with the phone number on it to call and register noise complaints.
- C. Work with SMAAC to develop strategies (HPOL representative on SMAAC) and work with MN Public Lobby and Citizens for a Better Environment.
- D. Limit air freight and charter flights to certain hours and/or quieter planes.

Actions: Neighborhood

- provide staff support to recruit volunteers and coordinate activities.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7.

Timeline: 1994-1998

2. **Neighborhood Objective:** Encourage public transportation options that have less impact on neighborhoods and the environment.

Strategies:

- A. Support the creation of alternate land travel improvements including funding of the High Speed Train Study (Phase 11).
- B. Increase intra-neighborhood communication and liaison with the Neighborhood Transportation Network (NTN), Joint Ministry Project, and/or other groups working on any interstate highway (35W/LRT) issue that impacts the HPDL neighborhood. Sponsor petition-letter drives to City Council members, legislators, and governor.
- C. No new lanes on 35W without prior development of LRT.

- D. Support the concept of light rail transit and support any future expansion of LRT between cities, to the suburbs, and using existing rail lines whenever feasible.
- E. Fund LRT. Possible sources include: extend the 6'h % sales tax to gasoline, ncrease the gas tax *by* 5 cents per gallon, or other means.
- F. Continue to encourage even greater development of incentives to encourage people to use mass transit to downtown.

Actions: *Mpls Public Works*

will continue working with MnDOT regarding City Council Resolution 92R-215, which states that " MnDOT should incorporate LRT into the 1-35W design, *such* that it can be constructed and open to revenue service in advance of consideration of highway reconstruction to provide a strong transit alternative to additional SOV use. City Council - *supports* funding LRT and has adopting Resolution 93R-035 which supports the extension of the 6'h % sales tax to sale of gasoline on a statewide basis, with a significant portion of the funds so raised to be dedicated to the *support* of public transit in the metropolitan area.

Neighborhood

provide staff *support* to recruit volunteers and coordinate activities.

Resources: *NRP Funds* See Part I, Objective 7.

Timeline: 1994-1998

- 3. **Neighborhood Objective:** Improve access to public facilities through better city and suburban MTC services.

Strategies:

- A. Address the problems of neighborhood city streets being used as park and ride locations.
 - i) Work with Windom and fuller neighborhoods, MTC, Mayflower Church, NRP, City, and MnDOT to investigate the creation of a Park & Ride in conjunction with Mayflower Church parking lot, providing a place for parkers away from HPDL streets.
 - ii) Investigate parking restrictions for HPDL -streets without negatively impacting other neighborhoods.

Actions: Metrooolitan Transit Commission

- work with neighborhoods to examine the creation of a Park and Ride ._, facility in conjunction with Mayflower Church parking lot.

Mpls Public Works

- conduct necessary "Park and Ride" traffic studies.

Neighborhood

- work with Windom and Fuller neighborhoods, the MTC, Mayflower Church, NRP, City of Minneapolis, and MDOT to investigate the creation of a Park and Ride facility in conjunction with Mayflower Church parking lot;
- investigate parking restrictions for neighborhood streets without negatively impacting other neighborhoods;
- assist Fuller neighborhood to leverage Mayflower Church and MTC funds as possible.

Resources: NRP Funds \$15,000 - Neighborhood "park and ride" traffic study.
MTC To be determined.
Private To be determined.

Timeline: 1994-1996

- B. Work with the MTC to create an East-West pilot bus route to improve bus service to the eastern portion of the neighborhood, possibly along 54th Street.
- C. Work with the MTC to provide mini-buses for bus route "pockets" not served by bigger routes, possibly powered by natural gas (explore bike racks),, maybe including seasonal routes or a park circuit along Minnehaha Parkway. Increase the number of express ruutes and provide designated parking for feeder service to U of M express routes and provide designated parking for riders.
- D. Work with the MTC to provide bus route education for residents and market routes to increase local ridership, especially as routes change.
- E. Work with the MTC to continue to increase bus safety.
- F. Support MTC in its plans to develop "hub and spoke" design bus routes that will incorporate movement patterns required for LRT, prior to LRT start, making sure that the HPDL neighborhood is served adequately. Encourage "LRT. demonstrator" bus routeVsystem wherever feasible elsewhere in the city, always working in accord with affected neighborhood residents.

Actions: Neighborhood

- provide staff support to recruit volunteers and coordinate activities.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7.

Timeline: 1994-1998

SECTION V: PART VII - CITY/COUNTY STREETS AND SERVICES

Neighborhood Goal: Increase the amount of input and impact of neighborhood viewpoints in planning for city-and county services.

1. **Neighborhood Objective:** Plan and design street improvements throughout the neighborhood.

Strategies:

- A. Perform a neighborhood street and traffic study emphasizing such matters as ingress and egress to the neighborhood, particularly at Cedar Avenue; ways to slow traffic; improve aesthetics on streets missing boulevards; how to add bike lanes to downtown; improve parking at "commercial areas for customers; and decrease the impact of commuter parking at bus stops on businesses and residents.

Implement recommendations of the above study. Work with the Public Works Department to determine scope of implementation and work out necessary funding packages using existing budgets where possible.

Actions: Mpls Public Works

- request in partnership with the Planning Department a transportation staff person to comprehensive street and traffic studies;
 - develop a master plan for the neighborhood to guide the City's actions to avoid solving a problem at the expense of other areas.
- Neighborhood
- provide staff support to ensure implementation of this and other City and County Services objectives.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7;
\$30,000 - Neighborhood street and traffic study.
Private To be determined.

Timeline: 1994-1998

2. **Neighborhood Objective:** Enhance the physical structure of the neighborhood through safe and suitable streets and responsive city services.

Strategies:

- A. Reduce the speed and enhance the beauty of Park and Portland Avenues all the way downtown to improve character and safety, working with all affected neighborhoods. Create commuter bike lanes, parking bays, and other means to reduce speed and create more neighborly atmosphere.
- B. Support city efforts to have speed limits lowered.

HPDL Action Plan

Section V

- C. Work on problem speeding areas in the neighborhood, particularly Portland and Cedar Avenues. Add treed medians to Portland Avenue between Minnehaha Creek and 61 st Street to improve aesthetics. Investigate parking bays or other means of slowing traffic to improve safety on Cedar Avenue.

Actions: Mpls Public Works

- supports a reduction in the speed limit and will work in the 1994 legislative session to achieve the goal of lowering speed limits; prepare design and cost estimate for adding a median to Portland Avenue between Minnehaha Creek and E. 61st Street;
- prepare in 1996-1997 funding participation for the median including assessments against benefitting property owners;
- implement median project in 1997-1998.

Neighborhood

provide staff *support* to ensure implementation of this and other City and County Services objectives.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part 1, Objective 7;
\$50,000 - Public improvements,

Timeline: 1994-1998

- D. Build a path under the bridge for pedestrian and bikers at Cedar Avenue and Lake Nokomis (See Part III, Parks and Recreation, Objective 4.B.).

Actions: Mpls Public Works

- has found there is adequate headroom under Cedar Avenue bridge for installation of a path;
- will relay information to the Park Board.

Mpls Park Board

- utilize information from Public Works in association with Part 111, Parks and Recreation, Objective 5.

Neighborhood

- provide staff support to ensure implementation of this and other City and County Services objectives.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7;
See Part III, Objective 5.

Timeline: 1995-1997

- E. Support continued reduction of cruising and speeding around Lake Nokomis and work for increased lighting of paths around Lake Nokomis and along Minnehaha Creek.

F. Work towards increased lighting in alleys.

Actions: Neighborhood

provide staff support to ensure implementation of this and other City and County Services objectives.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7.

Timeline: 1994-1998

3. Neighborhood Objective: Improve neighborhood appearance and City services to residents

Strategies:

A. Work with MnDOT to improve appearance and function of highway bridges and adjacent areas in the neighborhood within plans for highway reconstruction for safety and LRT. (decorative railings and lighting; adding more space for pedestrian and bicyclists; adding landscape and noise barriers to minimize disruption of construction-start now so that plantings will be of mature size when action construction starts)

Actions: Mpls Public Works

- will continue working with MnDOT on aesthetics;
- provide information on the recommendations from the Freeway Aesthetic and Landscape Task Force to neighborhood. Neighborhood
- provide staff support to ensure implementation of this and other City and County Services objectives.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7.

Timeline: 1994-1998

B. Work with Public Works to more clearly publicize snow plowing strategies, and support efforts to further improve service.

Actions: Mpls Public Works

distribute to the neighborhood groups the brochure being developed that explains techniques and procedures for snowplowing.

Neighborhood

provide staff support to ensure implementation of this and other City and County Services objectives.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7.

Public Works Existing budget.

Timeline: 1994-1995

- C. Support changing legislation mandating weight/volume base for sanitation services, until the issue of possible "avoidance" dumping of trash into resident, business, and church containers are resolved.
- D. Address the impact of highway run-off on local watersheds, especially into Diamond Lake by constructing grit chambers within storm drains. Examine impact of highway construction on Diamond Lake and the wetland area at Crosstown and Portland Avenue.

Actions: Mpls Public Works

- supports neighborhood's weight/volume base proposal; will be requesting extension to state law which requires the development of a weight/volume based plan by January 1-; 1994;
- has provided comments to MnDOT on the I-35W draft EIS that the City supports the construction of grit chambers within storm drains to accomplish partial removal of heavy sediments and pollutants rather than the construction of sedimentation ponds that require the acquisition of eight houses.

Neighborhood

- provide staff support to ensure implementation of this and other City and County Services objectives.

Resources: NRP Funds See Part I, Objective 7.

Timeline: 1994-1998